

11/25/70

Dear Paul,

A fortunate development in which you may be interested reduces even more the time I have today. I sent you copies of a letter to Jim in which I outlined questions to be asked of a N.O. but he could by political sympathy, interview for me as others could not. He has conducted this interview on tape and I will be meeting him at the bus station before too long. For a number of reasons, however, your letter of 11/21 is the first I address today.

Re your revisions: I spoke to Howard Sunday, when I was near Philadelphia. He referred to your letter from the Archives confirming that they have and are withholding the Happer pix. I believe I first gave this stuff to you in 1966, after I'd gotten it and when I was in Calif. I do not believe you ever sent me copies of your correspondence. As you know, I had this in PM. I also had asked the A for everything and they assured me they had given me everything. The did not tell me they had and are withholding the pix! In fact, they answered Howard's specific request with the statement they didn't have it. So, I am surprised that you did not inform me of this and ask for the letter for two potential uses: in court, addressing the fidelity of the A, their given word, and the sanctity of their preservatons; and possible use in PM if I can ever go further with that trilogy, as I hope to sometime. I do pain the third part as my next writing.

Among the things A and CBS were allowed to do at the Archives is handle the evidence. However, they, like you, apparently, still do not understand Z. I here skip to your letter enclosed, to either HR or KB, where you do not recognize that the leftward and backward motions of the body are separate and separated by a sufficient interval to make it seem impossible that the force that caused the backward motion also caused that to the left. I regret K cannot tell you of the new Z discoveries, based upon the kind of work that should have been done first by the government and then by its apologist, Alvarez. For whatever little my word may be worth to you, I assure you that you should take my cautions seriously, as should Alvarez, if he intends publication, for that publication might be just the thing that could make possibly my own, providing a reasonable expectation of response-especially if he is given electronic coverage, in which event, if I am refused equal time, I will go to the FCC and, if rejected, to the courts, and will, without doubt, have ample opportunity to attach all this evidence to the complaint I will make.

As to the lack of specification in the letter of the leaking of Howard's information; panel letters. I would appreciate two copies of anything you may send on this, unless you send one to Howard yourself.

What you sent on the Wasp fingerprint is what I asked. Thanks. By now you should have the very rough draft of that complaint, which will be reorganized and amplified with this and the Caire rejections. That which related to Q is to be out insofar as you wanted it out. I will replace it with the widow's statement, which is similar and less definitive-and is a remarkable testimonial to her husband's sensitivity, if nothing else.

If not here, in time I would like to go into the Vallee and FPCC possible suits. I think it would be excellent if you file them there. You can do it yourself, you would be better advised to have legal help, and a law student may be sufficient. I have some knowledge of precedents, copies of some, and am trying, through the back door, to get Bud to end some of his futilities and get more of this done. I do not think the Vallee suit need be relatively weak under the American Mail decision, which says that even reference to what may be properly withheld waives any right to withhold. And I do know whose car it was. The lawyer need not have special experience, since this is a new law and there are no specialists. However, it would be a civil case and a civil lawyer, I assume, would be better than one specializing in criminal cases. I suggest a good courtroom lawyer is an asset, one quick at catching and clobbering lies and deceptions, which you should expect.

Until you prepare your complaint, decisions on stepping on toes are premature. I do say, for whatever importance you might care to attribute to it, that you have done well with caution while, on the other hand, as soon as I beat them on Ray then delivered without question or even delay the very next thing I asked for, and I regard it as one of the more significant of my more recent acquisitions.

In your 11/18 letter to HR you improperly compare distlike fragments of soft lead with microscopic traces of relatively hard copper. This cannot be done. Nor is the measurement given in the letter to RB that of what can be called dust-like. I have consulted a radiologist (RML (PMIII)) and suggest you also might, to see just how minute-much smaller than your illustration- a particle of lead will be like a fluorescent light on an X-ray. I am not competent to discuss the magnitude of Thompson's error. However, I can tell you this: independently and separated by about 2500 miles, two engineers told me that for what he postulated to have happened not less than the energy of a 37mm artillery shell would have been required. I do not understand your illustration, but I also do not see the possibility I held forth, that in adjoining frames the shutter had been operated in the first at the beginning of the interval in the second at the end, which is more than a 50% error. When I first thought of this I asked two experienced photographers, both professionals, and they are in accord with what I wondered about. I think that in this as in your response to Dick you make too little of practical knowledge and seek to substitute science that is evasive and immaterial, since theory cannot replace fact nor prove fact other than fact. Hence my references that you probably found unpleasant, to flat world science and fairies and needles thinking.

Being neither a ballistics expert nor a scientist, perhaps my evaluation of your response to Dick is of no import to you. However, it is this: you have evaded and not answered. I find here what I have called to your attention before, your failure to prove your work right, which is your responsibility, and a tendency to deprecate criticism of it on that ground that the criticism, in your opinion, does not persuade you you are wrong. You do have this affirmative obligation. Aside from this, your responses are not persuasive. They are not based on experience, not based on credible observation, not based on even the relevant material, for you ignore the design and behavior of a full-jacketed military bullet. That cannot, simple cannot, deposit such dustlike particles. The composition and the convention are designed to preclude it. It is incumbent upon you to prove that such dustlike particles can be deposited by a) a bullet like 399 and b) in this pattern, under the theorized conditions. This you avoid. I think that you would do well to bear in mind two other things: the receipt, which I now have, does not match the exhibit; and one of the fragments, despite the great care so touted in court by the Archives, did not prevent disappearance of one of the fragments.

I want, before closing, to emphasize that the filing of suits can be a very constructive thing and want to encourage you to do it. We should discuss the possible approaches when you are ready (i.e. Bud's barebones in the spectro and my detailed explanation in clothing). There are arguments both ways, but I have a firm opinion based upon both theorizing and experience.

If there is anything in this interview that would interest you, or if you would like to have a dub for no one but you (perhaps Hal or the Whites also) to hear, let me know the kind of machine on which you'd use it and I'll undertake to provide it when I can.

As soon as I can find the time, I will return to the Ferrie complaint, so I'd appreciate any suggestions you can make as soon as you can. Include also reorganization and breakdown, for while we do have one worked out, it is always possible this, too, can be improved. I'll be adding the two related requests to both the complaint and the addendum, with the documentation.

I regret now that you returned those things you found, apparently misfiled, when you were lost for it is becoming apparent that there is a distinct possibility there is in the works a framing of the SS.

I enclose a poor copy of the spectro answer by Bud, which you can keep, and of the amended answer by the government, which I'd like returned as soon as possible (my only copy). Please ask Bud for whatever else you need. I have asked for a copy of the transcript of the hearing, which will be available for copying, as I have already written.

Sincerely,